

REF ID: A66558-2624

The Honorable Maurice H. Stans  
Director  
Bureau of the Budget  
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Stans:

I have received a copy of the Enrolled Bill, S. 385, entitled "Government Employees Training Act," with a request for views of this Agency.

As early as 1952 this Agency expressed its view both to the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission that it objected to the inclusion of CIA in over-all training legislation applicable to the Government generally. In addition, we stated our view that the training authority contained in Section 4 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (P. L. 110 of the 81st Congress) should remain available to the Agency. A copy of our letter dated 5 January 1952 to the Bureau of the Budget is enclosed. In a subsequent letter dated 8 February 1955 (copy enclosed), the Agency commented to the Bureau of the Budget on a draft training bill prepared by the Civil Service Commission. In that letter we objected to the draft bill on the ground that it repealed the training authorities contained in Section 4 of P. L. 110 and did not exempt CIA from the bill.

In S. 385 as it was originally passed by the Senate on 12 April 1957, the Agency was exempted and our statutory training authorities were not amended or repealed. That version of S. 385 was approved by the Bureau of the Budget, Civil Service Commission and the Department of Defense. I am somewhat disturbed that the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission approved the provisions of H. R. 6001 in lieu of the Senate approved version of S. 385 in light of our previously expressed objections both oral and written. These actions were taken without notification to the Agency by the Bureau of the Budget or Civil Service Commission.

It is my view that when proposed legislation amends or repeals provisions pertaining to the Agency whether in the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, or the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended (P. L. 110), the Agency should be consulted. Especially do I believe this where our opposition in principle to certain proposals previously has been made known to the Bureau of the Budget.

It is noted that under Section 4 (b) of S. 385, the President is authorized to designate any department as excepted from this Act or a provision of this Act. In my review of S. 385 there are a substantial number of reporting requirements and other restrictions which, if made applicable to this Agency, would adversely affect the operations of the Agency and the national interest. I do not believe it desirable or appropriate that the unique programs of this Agency be subject to the regulatory and reporting requirements of S. 385 which were designed for the more normal activities of the Government in general.

As a matter of principle I am opposed to inclusion of this Agency in the Enrolled Bill, S. 385, which repeals Section 4 of P. L. 110. However, since it is my understanding that the Administration views this legislation as being of substantial benefit to certain other departments and agencies, I shall not object further to its approval by the President provided it is assured that this Agency will be granted the broadest possible exceptions immediately upon the bill becoming law. I should also like to reserve the right to request the Administration and the Congress at some later date to enact legislation which would reinstate the repealed provisions of P. L. 110.

Sincerely,

Allen W. Dulles  
Director

Enclosures - 2

Ltr dtd 5 Jan 52

Ltr dtd 8 Feb 55

Distribution:

O & 1 - Addressee	1 - DD/S
1 - DCI	1 - Comptroller
1 - DDCI	1 - Legislative Counsel
1 - ER	